

Serial No. 09/964,533

Docket No. LGE-0015

Amdt. dated November 29, 2006

Reply to Office Action of September 21, 2006

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached drawings includes changes to Fig. 3. This sheet, which includes Fig. 3, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 3.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes.

REMARKS

By the present response, Applicants have canceled claim 9 without disclaimer. Further, Applicants have amended Fig. 3 and claims 1, 3, 14, 17, 19, 22, 23 and 25 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-8 and 10-31 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, claims 1-10, 12-25 and 28-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,615,018 (Wu et al.). Claims 11, 26 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,400,996 (Hoffberg).

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1-10, 12-25 and 28-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Wu et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Wu et al. discloses a recording-playback device which records pictures and an information value signal, and plays back the recorded pictures. A speed controller responsive to the information value signal adjusts the speed of the recording-playback device during a fast-scan search (i.e., fast-forward or fast-backward search). The fast-scan search speed is adjusted so that the recorded pictures with high information values are played back at a slower fast-scan speed and the recorded pictures with low information values are played back at a faster fast-scan

speed. The information value signal is generated during recording or during playback. The information value signal has a low value when a correlation between temporally successive recorded pictures is high and a high value when the correlation is low, the correlation depending upon temporal redundancy between the successive video pictures.

Regarding claims 1, 23 and 25 Applicants submit that Wu et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, *inter alia*, where the complexity is defined based on additional information on a length of shot segment, wherein the complexity is defined as simple in a case that a length of a shot segment is long and the complexity is defined as more complicated in a case that shots having short shot segments consecutively appear. The Examiner appears to assert that Wu et al. discloses these limitations in col. 3, lines 10-23. However, these portions merely disclose that the information value signal has a lower value when the correlation between temporality successive recorded pictures is higher and has a higher value when the correlation is lower, and that the correlation depends upon the temporal redundancy between the successive video pictures. This is not the complexity being defined based on additional information on a length of shot segments, where the complexity is defined as simple in a case that a length of a shot segment is long and is defined as more complicated in a case that shots having short shot segments consecutively appear, as recited in the claims of the present application. Wu et al. does not disclose or suggest complexity being defined based on a length of shot segment. Further, Wu et al. does not

disclose or suggest the complexity being simple in a case that a length of a shot segment is long,
and the complexity being defined as more complicated in a case that shots having short
segments consecutively appear.

Regarding claims 2-8, 10, 12-22, 23 and 28-31, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 23 and 25 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Wu et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1-8, 10, 12-25 and 28-31 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 11, 26 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu et al. in view of Hoffberg et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and submit that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1 and 25 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims. Applicants submit that Hoffberg et al. does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Wu et al.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of

Serial No. **09/964,533**

Docket No. **LGE-0015**

Amdt. dated November 29, 2006

Reply to Office Action of September 21, 2006

each of claims 11, 26 and 27 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Serial No. 09/964,533

Docket No. LGE-0015

Amdt. dated November 29, 2006

Reply to Office Action of September 21, 2006

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-8 and 10-31 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK/FDB:tlg

Date: November 29, 2006

\\Fk4\Documents\2039\2039-015\107735.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610

09/964,533
Ji Eun Lee et al.



FIG. 3

